REMARKS:

The Office Action dated September 26, 2006, has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the present paper, which is believed to be fully responsive to that Office Action, has been prepared. The following includes a summary of the Office Action and Applicants' arguments in favor of patentability.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-41 were presented in the original application and are pending. Claims 16-18, 21-24, and 36-38 are being cancelled. Thus, upon entry of this paper in the record, claims 1-15, 19, 20, 25-35, and 39-41 will be pending in the application.

Summary of the September 26, 2006, Office Action

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, but indicated that he would allow claim 1 if it were amended to clarify that "...cyclonic spin on contaminant-laden air..." means "wherein the cyclone chamber is configured to impart a cyclonic spin...." Claims 2-15, 19, 20, 25-35, and 39-41 are also indicated as being allowed if rewritten in the same manner and to include all of the limitations recited in the base claim and any intervening claims from which those claims depend.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner states that a translation of the foreign priority application should be provided to remove GB 2377656 as prior art with respect to the present application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 16-18, 22-24, and 36-38 on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 of "co-pending" U.S. Patent Appl. No. 10/620,892 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,933 to *Oh et al.* In the Office Action, this is characterized as a provisional obviousness rejection because at the time it issued on September 26, 2006, the Examiner apparently understood that the '892 application had not yet issued as a patent and it had not yet been published (when, in fact, it issued on September 12, 2006, as U.S. Patent No. 7,105,035). The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to combine the two references to arrive at the claimed invention because of the allegedly known benefits and advantages stated in the *Oh et al.* patent.

The Examiner has rejected claims 16-18, 22-24, and 36-38 as being unpatentable (i.e., obvious, or lack of inventive step) over U.S. Patent Appl. Publication No. 2004/0200028 in view of *Oh et al.* The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to combine the two references to arrive at the claimed invention because of the known benefits and advantages stated in the *Oh et al.* patent.

Finally, the Examiner has further rejected claims 16 and 18, and has also rejected claim 19, as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,042,628 to *Nishikiori et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,779,745 to *Kilstrom.* The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to combine the two references to arrive at the claimed invention in order to "further remove dust particles prior to exhausting the air."

Rejection of Claim Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Applicant acknowledges and appreciates the Examiner's allowance of claim 1 if rewritten to overcome the aforementioned § 112, second paragraph, rejection. In order to overcome the § 112, second paragraph, rejection, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite the language suggested by the Examiner. Thus, it is believed that claim 1 complies with § 112, second paragraph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under § 112, second paragraph, are requested. Claim 1, and dependent claims 2-15, are thus in condition for allowance. The issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Allowance of Claims 2-15, 19, 20, 25-35, and 39-41

Applicant acknowledges and appreciates the Examiner's allowance of claims 2-15, 19, 20, 25-35, and 39-41 if rewritten to include all of the limitations recited in the base claim and any intervening claims from which those claims depend. With regard to claims 2-15, those claims are believed to be in condition for allowance because they depend from claim 1.

As to claims 19, 20, 25-35, and 39-41, those claims have been rewritten in independent form, or are dependent upon a claim rewritten in independent form. Thus, those claims are also in condition for allowance. The issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Translation of the Foreign Priority Application

Enclosed herewith is a copy of an English translation of the foreign priority application.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 16-18, 22-24, and 36-38 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Appl. Publication No. 2004/0200028 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,933 to *Oh et al.* The Examiner has further rejected claims 16 and 18, and has also rejected claim 19, as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,042,628 to *Nishikiori et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,779,745 to *Kilstrom.*

Applicant has cancelled claims 16-18, 22-24, and 36-38, without prejudice to his right to re-file those claims in a separate application, thereby rendering the rejection of those claims under § 103(a) as moot. Claim 19 was indicated as being allowable, as noted above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16-18, 19, 22-24, and 36-38 under § 103(a) are requested.

Double-Patenting Rejection

As indicated previously, the Examiner has rejected claims 16-18, 22-24, and 36-38 on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting. As noted above, Applicant has cancelled claims 16-18, 22-24, and 36-38, without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejection of those claims on double-patenting grounds as moot. Applicant respectfully submits that no terminal disclaimer is necessary.